Accepted for publication in IJMPD

arXiv:1401.1402v2 [gr-qc] 14 Apr 2015

Fluid sphere: stability problem and dimensional constraint

FAROOK RAHAMAN
Department of Mathematics, Jadavpur University, Kolkata 700 032, West Bengal, India
rahaman@iucaa.ernet.in

ANIRUDH PRADHAN
Department of Mathematics, GLA University, Mathura 281406, U.P., India
pradhan@iucaa.ernet.in

NASR AHMED
Mathematics Department, Deanery of Academic Services, Taibah University, Saudi Arabia and Astronomy Department, National Research Institute of Astronomy & Geophysics, Helwan, Cairo, Egypt
abualansar@gmail.com

SAIBAL RAY
Department of Physics, Government College of Engineering & Ceramic Technology, Kolkata 700 010, West Bengal, India
saibal@iucaa.ernet.in

BIJAN SAHA
Laboratory of Information Technologies, Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, 141980 Dubna, Moscow region, Russia
bijan@jinr.ru

MOSIUR RAHAMAN
Department of Mathematics, Meghnad Saha Institute of Technology, Kolkata 700150, West Bengal, India
mosiurju@gmail.com

Received Day Month Year
Revised Day Month Year

Communicated by Managing Editor

We study different dimensional fluids inspired by noncommutative geometry which admit conformal Killing vectors. The solutions of the Einstein field equations examined specifically for five different set of spacetime. We calculate the active gravitational mass and impose stability conditions of the fluid sphere. The analysis thus carried out immediately indicates that at 4-dimension only one can get a stable configuration for any spherically symmetric stellar system and any other dimensions, lower or higher, becomes untenable

as far as the stability of a system is concerned.

Keywords: General Relativity; noncommutative geometry; higher dimensions
PACS: 04.40.Nr; 04.20.Jb; 04.04.Dg

1. Introduction

Higher dimensional spacetime configuration is particularly important in the studies of the early phase of the Universe. It plays a significant role to describe not only the universe in early stage of its evolution but also some unobservable phenomena in the physical universe.

It is interesting to point out that Barrow [1] was the first to investigate the role of spacetime dimensions in determining the form of various physical laws and constants of Nature. Basically he [1] employed the concept of fractal dimension under Kaluza-Klein theories obtained by dimensional reduction from higher dimensional gravity or supergravity theories. It has therefore been argued that the presently observed $4D$ spacetime is the compactified form of manifold with higher dimensions and as such in the arena of grand unification theory and also in superstring theory this kind of self-compactification idea of multidimensions have been invoked by different researchers [2,3]. There are also several other research articles available in the literature in connection to higher spatial dimensions some of which can be consulted in the following Refs. [4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15].

In cosmology, the Kaluza-Klein inflationary theory with higher dimensions, it is believed that extra dimensions are reducible specially to four dimension which was associated with some physical processes. Ishihara [16] and later on Gegenberg and Das [17] have shown that within the Kaluza-Klein inflationary scenario of higher dimension a contraction of the internal space causes the inflation of the usual space. It is argued by Ibanèz and Verdaguer [18] that there are cases in FRW cosmologies where the extra dimensions contract as a result of cosmological evolution.

It has been observed that symmetries of geometrical as well as physical relevant quantities of general relativity, known as collineations and conformal Killing vectors (CKV), are most useful to facilitate generation of exact solutions to the Einstein field equations [19]. Since it is a key ingredient of the methodology of the present paper so we would like to add here a few more sentences in connection to collineations and conformal Killing vectors. We note that a great details on conformal collineations (a generalization of conformal Killing vector fields and affine collineations and projective collineations) that inherit the Ricci curvature (that is, preserve it up to a scalar factor) have been analyzed on semi-Riemannian manifolds with divergence-free Riemannian curvature tensors by Beem and Duggal [20]. Apostolopoulos and Tsamparlis [21] argue that the proper Ricci and Matter (inheritance) collineations are the (conformal) Killing vectors of the generic metric which are not (conformal) Killing vectors of the space-time metric and using this observation they compute the Ricci and Matter inheritance collineations of the Robertson-Walker space-times and we determine the Ricci and Matter collineations without

any further calculations. However, this conformal Ricci and Matter Collineations technique has been employed for an anisotropic fluid [22]. There are some other notable works on collineations and conformal Killing vectors available in the following Refs. [23,24,25,26,27].

Therefore, in the present investigation following Yavuz et al. [28], we have imposed the condition that the spacetime manifold admits a CKV and thus tried to tackle the anisotropic field equations in a suitably better way.

In connection to the anisotropic field equations of general relativity the study of compact objects has been of ample interest for a long time. It was argued long ago by Bowers and Liang [29] that the effects of local anisotropy may have important role for relativistic fluid spheres to attain hydrostatic equilibrium in connection to maximum equilibrium mass and surface redshift. Ruderman [30] showed that in the stellar interior the nuclear matter may have anisotropic features at least in certain very high density ranges ($> 10^{15}\ gm/cm^3$) and thus advocated to treat the nuclear interaction relativistically. Very recently, based on some observed compact stars Kalam et al. [31] made an extensive analysis to show the anisotropic behavior of the samples.

Therefore, under the above theoretical background our motivation is indeed to study stability problem and dimensional constraint in connection to solutions of higher dimensional spherically symmetric systems within the framework of noncommutative geometry. The present investigation thus based on the following scheme: After providing the basic field equations of Einstein in the Sec. II, we seek the solutions under CKV in Sec. III for various dimensions ranging from $3D$ to $11D$ spacetime. Sec. IV deals with active gravitational mass where we get indication for minimum potential energy at $4D$ spacetime. Therefore, in Sec. V we continue our investigation by imposing equilibrium conditions and arrive at the conclusion that higher dimensional spacetime is not tenable for stability of the system. Sec. VI offers some concluding remarks in favor of the results obtained.

2. The Basic Field Equations of Einstein

The spacetime metric describing a spherically symmetric system in higher dimension is taken as

$$ds^2 = -e^{\nu(r)}dt^2 + e^{\lambda(r)}dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega_n^2, \tag{1}$$

where the line element ${d\Omega_n}^2$ on the unit n-sphere is given by

$$\begin{aligned} {d\Omega_n}^2 = {d\theta_1}^2 + sin^2\theta_1 {d\theta_2}^2 + sin^2\theta_1 sin^2\theta_2 {d\theta_3}^2 \\ + ... + \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} sin^2\theta_i {d\theta_n}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

The general energy momentum tensor which is compatible with static spherically symmetry as

$$T^{\mu}_{\nu} = (\rho + p_r)u^{\mu}u_{\nu} - p_r g^{\mu}_{\nu} + (p_t - p_r)\eta^{\mu}\eta_{\nu} \tag{3}$$

with $u^\mu u_\mu = -\eta^\mu \eta_\mu = 1$.

The Einstein equations (for the geometrized units $G = c = 1$) are

$$e^{-\lambda}\left(\frac{n\lambda'}{2r} - \frac{n(n-1)}{2r^2}\right) + \frac{n(n-1)}{2r^2} = 8\pi\rho, \tag{4}$$

$$e^{-\lambda}\left(\frac{n(n-1)}{2r^2} + \frac{n\nu'}{2r}\right) - \frac{n(n-1)}{2r^2} = 8\pi p_r, \tag{5}$$

$$\frac{e^{-\lambda}}{2}\left[\frac{1}{2}(\nu')^2 + \nu'' - \frac{1}{2}\lambda'\nu' + \frac{(n-1)}{r}(\nu' - \lambda') + \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{r^2}\right] - \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2r^2} = 8\pi p_t, \tag{6}$$

where ρ, p_r and p_t are respectively the energy density, radial pressure and tangential pressure of the static fluid sphere. Here $'$ over ν and λ denotes partial derivative w.r.t. radial coordinate r only.

The energy density having a minimal spread Gaussian profile in higher dimension is taken as [32,33]

$$\rho = \frac{m}{(4\pi\theta)^{(n+1)/2}}\ exp\left(-\frac{r^2}{4\theta}\right), \tag{7}$$

Here, m is the total mass of the source which can be diffused throughout a region of linear dimension $\sqrt{\theta}$ due to the uncertainty and generally assumed to be closed to the Planck length scale.

3. The Solutions under Conformal Killing Vectors

To find the exact solution, as is indicated in the introductory part, we use the well known inheritance symmetry of the spacetime as the symmetry under conformal Killing vectors [34,35] given as:

$$L_\xi g_{ik} = \xi_{i;k} + \xi_{k;i} = \psi g_{ik}, \tag{8}$$

where ψ is an arbitrary function of r.

The above conformal Killing Eqs. (8) provide the following set:

$$\xi^1\nu' = \psi; \tag{9}$$

$$\xi^{n+2} = c_1 = \ constant; \tag{10}$$

$$\xi^1 = \frac{\psi r}{2}; \tag{11}$$

$$\xi^1\lambda' + 2\xi^1_{,1} = \psi, \tag{12}$$

where the subscript of comma denotes the partial derivative w.r.t. r. Here in the second expression θ's are involved, however being constant we have taken those as c_1.

These Eqs. (9) - (12) imply

$$e^{\nu} = c_2^2 r^2, \tag{13}$$

$$e^{\lambda} = \left(\frac{c_3}{\psi}\right)^2, \tag{14}$$

$$\xi^i = c_1 \delta^i_{n+2} + \left(\frac{\psi r}{2}\right)\delta^i_1, \tag{15}$$

where c_2 and c_3 are integration constants. The above Eqs. (13) - (15) contain all the characteristic features derived from the existence of the conformal collineation.

Now, using the values of ν and λ from Eqs. (13) and (14), we can solve the field equations for the given energy density (7), i.e. we try to find out here the unknowns ψ, p_r and p_t under different space-time with varying value of n, the index of dimension. As a sample study we only consider cases with $n = 1$, $n = 2$, $n = 3$, $n = 8$ and $n = 9$ representing $3D$, $4D$, $5D$, $10D$ and $11D$ spacetime respectively.

3.1. $3D$ *space-time* ($n = 1$)

Starting this case of lower space-time with $n = 1$, the metric potential can be given by

$$\lambda(r) = \ln\left(\frac{\theta}{4m(2\theta e^{-\frac{r^2}{4\theta}} - c_1)}\right), \tag{16}$$

where c_1 is an integration constant as mentioned earlier. Here in the above expression θ in the numerator and as multiplier in the denominator are im posed manually and can be taken as unity for simplicity.

Here the pressures are taking the forms:

$$p_r = \frac{m(2\theta e^{-\frac{r^2}{4\theta}} - c_1)}{2\pi\theta r^2}, \tag{17}$$

$$p_t = -\frac{m e^{-\frac{r^2}{4\theta}}}{4\pi\theta}. \tag{18}$$

In a similar way, by applying the boundary conditions at $r = R$, i.e. $p_R = 0$, at once we get

$$c_1 = 2\theta e^{-\frac{R^2}{4\theta}}. \tag{19}$$

3.1.1. *Matching conditions*

Our interior metric is

$$ds^2 = -c_2^2 r^2 dt^2 + e^{\lambda(r)} dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega_{n=1}. \tag{20}$$

We match our interior solution to the exterior BTZ metric given by

$$ds^2 = -(-M_0 - \Lambda r^2)dt^2 + (-M_0 - \Lambda r^2)^{-1} dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega_{n=1}. \tag{21}$$

So the matching conditions yield the following results:

$$c_1 = (M_o + \Lambda R^2)\frac{\theta}{4m} + 2\theta e^{-\frac{R^2}{4\theta}}, \quad c_2 = \frac{1}{R}\sqrt{-(M_o + \Lambda R^2)}. \tag{22}$$

If we now put the value of c_1 from Eq. (19), we get $M_0 + \Lambda R^2 = 0$ which is clearly impossible. Therefore, three dimensional fluid inspired by non commutative geometry admitting conformal killing vector is not physically viable.

3.2. *4D space-time (n = 2)*

This is the usual $4D$ space-time and in this case the metric potential can be given by

$$\lambda(r) = \ln\left[\frac{r\pi\sqrt{\pi\theta}}{-\pi\sqrt{\pi\theta}\left(r + c_1 - 2m\ erf\left(\frac{r}{2\sqrt{\theta}}\right)\right) - 2mre^{-\frac{r^2}{4\theta}}\pi}\right], \tag{23}$$

where $erf\left(\frac{r}{2\sqrt{\theta}}\right)$ is the error function.

Therefore, the radial and tangential pressure parameters, p_r and p_t, now are respectively taking the following forms:

$$p_r = \frac{-2r + 6m\ erf\left(\frac{r}{2\sqrt{\theta}}\right) - 3c_1 - \frac{6mr}{\sqrt{\pi\theta}}e^{-\frac{r^2}{4\theta}}}{8r^3\pi}, \tag{24}$$

$$p_t = \frac{\left(-\sqrt{\pi}\theta^2 + mr^2\sqrt{\theta}e^{-\frac{r^2}{4\theta}}\right)}{8(r\theta)^2(\pi\theta)^{3/2}}. \tag{25}$$

At the boundary surface ($r = R$) pressure should be considered as of vanishing order ($p_{r=R} = 0$). Thus we get the value of the constant c_1 as

$$c_1 = \frac{2}{3}\left[-R - 3\frac{mR}{\sqrt{\pi\theta}}e^{-\frac{R^2}{4\theta}} + 3m\ erf\left(\frac{R}{2\sqrt{2}}\right)\right]. \tag{26}$$

3.2.1. *Matching conditions*

In the present case our metric:

$$ds^2 = -c_2^2r^2dt^2 + e^{\lambda(r)}dr^2 + r^2d\Omega_{n=2}. \tag{27}$$

On the other hand, $4D$ metric is Schwarzschild metric and can be supplied as

$$ds^2 = -\left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)dt^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)^{-1}dr^2 + r^2d\Omega_2. \tag{28}$$

So matching conditions provide us the following expressions for the constant quantities:

$$c_1 = -2R + 2M + 2m\ erf\left(\frac{R}{2\sqrt{\theta}}\right) - \frac{2mR}{\sqrt{\pi\theta}}e^{-\frac{R^2}{4\theta}},$$

$$c_2 = \frac{1}{R}\sqrt{\frac{2M}{R} - 1}. \tag{29}$$

3.3. $5D$ *space-time* ($n = 3$)

Let us now move towards higher dimension by choosing the value of $n > 2$. The metric potential, the radial and tangential pressures for this $5D$ space-time can respectively be given by

$$\lambda(r) = \ln\left[\frac{3r^3\pi^2\theta}{\pi^2\theta(3r^2+2c_1)+2\pi m(r^2+4\theta)e^{-\frac{r^2}{4\theta}}}\right], \tag{30}$$

$$p_r = \frac{\pi\theta(9r^2+4c_1)+4m(r^2+4\theta)e^{-\frac{r^2}{4\theta}}}{8\pi^2r^4\theta}, \tag{31}$$

$$p_t = -\frac{-4\pi\theta^2+mr^2e^{-\frac{r^2}{4\theta}}}{16\pi^2r^2\theta^2}. \tag{32}$$

At $r = R$, $p_r(r = R) = 0$ and that gives $c_1 = -\frac{9}{4}R^2 - \frac{m}{\pi\theta}(R^2+4\theta)\exp(-\frac{R^2}{4\theta})$.

3.3.1. *Matching conditions*

Our metric in this case is

$$ds^2 = -c_2^2r^2dt^2 + e^{\lambda(r)}dr^2 + r^2d\Omega_{n=3}. \tag{33}$$

Again, the $5D$ Schwarzschild metric is

$$ds^2 = \left(1-\frac{8M}{3\pi r^2}\right)dt^2 + \left(1-\frac{8M}{3\pi r^2}\right)^{-1}dr^2 + r^2d\Omega_3. \tag{34}$$

So matching conditions on the boundary immediately give us:

$$c_1 = \frac{3}{2}(R^3-R^2) - \frac{4MR}{\pi} - \frac{m}{4\theta}(R^2+4\theta)e^{-R^2/4\theta},$$
$$c_2 = \frac{1}{R}\sqrt{1-\frac{8M}{3\pi R^2}}. \tag{35}$$

3.4. $10D$ *space-time* ($n = 8$)

For the arbitrary choice of $n = 8$ for higher dimensional case, we get the following results:

$$\lambda(r) = \ln(128r^7\pi^5\theta^4)$$
$$-\ln\left[32\theta^4\pi^5(4r^7+c_1) - 840\theta^4\pi^2m\ erf\left(\frac{r}{2\sqrt{\theta}}\right)\right.$$
$$\left.+\sqrt{\pi\theta}me^{-\frac{r^2}{4\theta}}\left(\pi r^7+14\theta^3\pi r^5+140\theta^5r^3+840\theta^7\pi r\right)\right], \tag{36}$$

$$p_r = -\frac{1}{256r^9\pi^6}\left(\pi^5(-2048r^4-288c_1)\right.$$
$$\left.+7560\pi^2m\ erf\left(\frac{r}{2\sqrt{\theta}}\right)\right)$$

$$-\frac{\sqrt{\theta\pi}me^{-\frac{r^2}{4\theta}}}{256r^9\pi^6\theta^4}\left(-9\pi r^7 - 126\theta\pi r^5 - 126\theta^2\pi r^3 - 7560\theta^3\pi r\right), \tag{37}$$

$$p_t = -\frac{-448\pi^4\theta^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{\pi}r^2me^{-\frac{r^2}{4\theta}}}{512r^2\pi^5\theta^{9/2}}. \tag{38}$$

At $r = R$, $p_r = 0$ and it provides

$$c_1 = -\frac{2048R^7}{288} + \frac{7560}{288\pi^3}m\ erf\left(\frac{R}{2\sqrt{\theta}}\right) - \frac{\sqrt{\pi\theta}me^{-\frac{R^2}{4\theta}}}{288\pi^4\theta^4}\left(9R^7 + 126\theta R^5 + 1260\theta^2R^3 + 7560\theta^3R\right). \tag{39}$$

3.5. 11*D space-time (n = 9)*

We would like to study one more higher dimensional case with $n = 9$. In this chosen case of $11D$ space-time, the metric potential and pressure parameters take the forms:

$$\lambda(r) = -\ln\left[\frac{64c_1 + 288r^8}{288r^8} + \frac{me^{-\frac{r^2}{4\theta}}(6144\theta^4 + 1536r^2\theta^3 + 192r^4\theta^2 + 16r^6\theta + r^8)}{r^8\theta^4\pi^4}\right], \tag{40}$$

$$p_r = \frac{320c_1 + 2592r^8}{256\pi r^{10}} + \frac{me^{-\frac{r^2}{4\theta}}(30720\theta^4 + 7680r^2\theta^3 + 960r^4\theta^2 + 80r^6\theta + 5r^8)}{256r^{10}\theta^4\pi^5}, \tag{41}$$

$$p_t = -\frac{-1024\theta^5\pi^4 + r^2me^{-\frac{r^2}{4\theta}}}{1024r^2\theta^5\pi^5}. \tag{42}$$

At $r = R$, $p_{r=R} = 0$ and we get

$$c_1 = -\frac{2592R^8}{320} - \frac{me^{\frac{-R^2}{4\theta}}}{320\pi^4\theta^4} \times(5R^8 + 80R^6\theta + 960R^4\theta^2 + 7680R^2\theta^3 + 30720\theta^4). \tag{43}$$

4. Active gravitational mass in various dimensions

We apply the following relation to calculate active gravitational mass in various dimensions [36]

$$M(R) = \int_0^R \left[\frac{2\pi^{\frac{n+1}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{n+1}{2})}\right] r^n\rho(r)dr. \tag{44}$$



Fig. 1. A plot of $M(R)$ (as vertical axis) with spacetime dimensions n (as horizontal axis) is drawn. In the figure specifically we have used the numerical values $m = 1.4\ M_{\odot}$, $R = 10$ km and $\theta = 0.002$ to plot $M(R)$ vs n graph. It is evident from the Fig. 1 that the function $M(R)$ increases in a blowing up manner as the number of dimensions increases except at the $4D$ spacetime which has a minimum value.

Now before drawing any conclusion from the above expression for mass, let us first see what is the lesson to be extracted from this study for our understanding of possible properties of different static and spherically symmetric fluid distribution. This obviously can be done through a systematic survey of the effect of higher dimensional spacetime for the different parameter set that fit for the observed stars. We have collected data for the masses of some compact objects, e.g. PSR J1614-2230 [$1.97 \pm 0.08\ M_{\odot}$ [37]], PSR J1903+327 [$1.667 \pm 0.02\ M_{\odot}$ [38]], Vela X-1 [$1.77 \pm 0.08\ M_{\odot}$ [39]], SMC X-1 [$1.29 \pm 0.05\ M_{\odot}$ [39]] and Cen X-3 [$1.29 \pm 0.08\ M_{\odot}$ [39]]. The corresponding radii have been calculated by Takisa et al. [40] which respectively are as follows: 10.30 km, 9.82 km, 9.99 km, 9.13 km and 9.51 km (also see the Refs. [31,41,42,43] for other data set for different compact stars).

Keeping in mind the above range of masses and radii, let us then realistically consider the following specific physical configuration of any compact star:
With the numerical values $m = 1.4\ M_{\odot}$, $R = 10$ km and $\theta = 0.002$, from a straight forward calculation, we get $M(R) = 39.39$, 55.70, 1.98, 111.40, 222.81, 630.22, 891.27, 2520.88 for the dimensions 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11 and 14 respectively. It is very interesting to note from the Fig. 1 that the function $M(R)$ increases in a blowing up manner as the number of dimensions increases but it has only one minimum at the $4D$ spacetime. There is also a small hump visible at $3D$ spacetime.

This means that noncommutative geometry admitting conformal Killing vectors with anisotropic fluid sphere permit only the 4-dimensional spacetime to make the spherically symmetric matter distribution in stable equilibrium.

5. Equilibrium: TOV equation for 4*D*

In view of the above result and discussion we are then in demand of verifying the equilibrium features of the spherically symmetric matter distribution. The active gravitational mass, for the present case, can be given by

$$-M_g\frac{p_r+\rho}{r^2}e^{\frac{\lambda-\nu}{2}}-\frac{dp_r}{dr}+\frac{2}{r}(p_t-p_r)=0, \tag{45}$$

where

$$M_g=M_g(r)=\frac{1}{2}r^2e^{\frac{\nu-\lambda}{2}}\frac{d\nu}{dr}. \tag{46}$$

Now equilibrium of the spherical symmetric system requires the following condition:

$$F_g+F_h+F_a=0, \tag{47}$$

where F_g, F_h and F_a are respectively the gravitational, hydrostatic and anisotropic forces.

Let us then provide the forces in action, i.e. gravitational, hydrostatic and anisotropic, respectively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}F_g&=-M_g\frac{p_r+\rho}{r^2}e^{\frac{\lambda-\nu}{2}}\\&=-\frac{1}{r}\left[\frac{-2r+6m\ erf(\frac{r}{2\sqrt{\theta}})-3c_1-\frac{6mr}{\sqrt{\pi\theta}}e^{-\frac{r^2}{4\theta}}}{8\pi r^3}\right.\\&\qquad\left.+\frac{m}{(4\pi\theta)^{\frac{3}{2}}}e^{-\frac{r^2}{4\theta}}\right],\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

$$\begin{aligned}F_h&=\frac{dp_r}{dr}\\&=\frac{d}{dr}\left[\frac{-2r+6m\ erf(\frac{r}{2\sqrt{\theta}})-3c_1-\frac{6mr}{\sqrt{\pi\theta}}e^{-\frac{r^2}{4\theta}}}{8\pi r^3}\right],\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

$$\begin{aligned}F_a&=\frac{2}{r}(p_t-p_r)\\&=\frac{2}{r}\left[\frac{-\sqrt{\pi}\theta^2+6mr^2\sqrt{\theta}e^{-\frac{r^2}{4\theta}}}{8(r\theta)^2(r\theta)^{\frac{3}{2}}}\right.\\&\quad\left.-\frac{-2r+6m\ erf(\frac{r^2}{2\sqrt{\theta}})-3c_1-\frac{6mr}{\sqrt{\pi\theta}}e^{-\frac{r^2}{4\theta}}}{8\pi r^3}\right].\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$



Fig. 2. A plot for the three different forces acting on the fluid elements in static equilibrium against r. It is to be noted from the figure that due to the joint action of F_g and F_a against F_h the system becomes stable at $4D$

Even though the differential Eq. (49) for F_h has not been worked out, yet one can draw information from Eq. (47) to have a primary conclusion. By using Maple we actually are able to plot without writing the derivative in analytical form. Thus, as far as the Fig. 2 is concerned, we observe that F_a is the most dominant factor whereas the least one is F_g. Moreover, at lower dimension the joint action of F_g and F_a is much more than F_h so that the system becomes unstable. On the other hand, as we approach towards $4D$ they balance each other and thus make a stable configuration.

6. Concluding Remarks

The analysis done in the foregoing section immediately indicates that at 4-dimension only one can get a stable configuration for any spherically symmetric stellar system as such higher dimension becomes untenable as far as the stability of a system is concerned. In a study on higher dimensional framework of noncommutative geometry Farook et al. [44], replace pointlike structures with smeared objects and have found that wormhole solutions exist in the usual four, as well as in five dimensions also (only in a very restricted region), but they do not exist in higher-dimensional spacetime.

However, it is now an open question whether the above remark is true for a noncommutative geometry admitting conformal Killing vectors or in any geometry

this becomes feasible. In this connection we note that Farook et al. [13] studied a generalized Schwarzschild spacetime with higher dimensions and performed a survey whether higher dimensional Schwarzschild spacetime is compatible with some of the solar system phenomena. As a sample test they examined four well known solar system effects, viz., (1) Perihelion shift, (2) Bending of light, (3) Gravitational redshift, and (4) Gravitational time delay. It has been shown by them that under a N-dimensional solutions of Schwarzschild type very narrow class of metrics the results related to all these physical phenomena are mostly incompatible with the higher dimensional version of general relativity.

In this regard a special point is to mention that in the present paper we deal only with spherical distributions. Therefore a obvious question may arise: what about possible departures from sphericity. It is well known that multipoles play relevant roles as can be noticed in several cases of practical interests, ranging from tests of fundamental physics in the field of stars, planets with crafts, to black holes and stellar systems used to probe their properties [45,46,47,48,49,50,51,52,53]. So, it would be important to see what happens to such kind of non-spherical distributions in more or less than 4-dimensions is a pertinent issue which will be the subject of further researches in our future projects.

Same remarks holds also for the influence of the rotation in a Kerr/Lense-Thirring-like way: does the angular momentum of the source influence the results, and, if so, to what extent? We note that there are several such investigations in different context [54,55,56,57]. Therefore, this problem may also be an issue of another future study.

As a final comment we would like to add here that a much more deep and comprehensive studies are required before offering a concluding remark in connection to stability of a spherically symmetric fluid distribution at $4D$ only.

Acknowledgments

FR, AP, NA and SR are thankful to the Inter-University Centre for Astronomy and Astrophysics (IUCAA), Pune, India for providing research facilities. FR is also grateful to UGC, India for financial support under its Research Award Scheme. We all express our grateful thanks to the anonymous referee for the several suggestions which have enabled us to improve the manuscript substantially.

References

1. J.D. Barrow, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A* **310**, 337 (1983)
2. J.H. Schwarz, *Superstrings*, World Scientific, Singapore (1985)
3. S. Weinberg, *Strings and Superstrings*, World Scientific, Singapore (1986)
4. H. Liu and J. M. Overduin, *Astrophys. J.* **538**, 386 (2000).
5. G. Dvali, G. Gabadadze and M. Porrati, *Phys. Lett. B* **485** 208 (2000)
6. G. Dvali, A. Gruzinov and M. Zaldarriaga, *Phys. Rev. D* **68** 024012 (2003)
7. L. Iorio, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **09**, 006 (2005)
8. L. Iorio, *Class. Quantum Gravit.* **22**, 5271 (2005)

9. L. Iorio, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **07** 008 (2005)
10. L. Iorio, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **01** 008 (2006)
11. L. Iorio and G. Giudice, *J. Cosmo. Astropart. Phys.* **08** 007 (2006)
12. V. Kagramanova, J. Kunz, and C. L. Lämmerzahl, *Phys. Lett. B* **634**, 465 (2006)
13. F. Rahaman, S. Ray, M. Kalam and M. Sarker, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **48**, 3124 (2009)
14. M. Andrews, Y.-Z. Chu and M. Trodden, *Phys. Rev. D* **88** 084028 (2013)
15. G. Renzetti, *New Astron.* **23** 63 (2013)
16. H. Ishihara, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **72**, 376 (1984)
17. J.D. Gegenberg and A. Das, *Phys. Lett. A* **112**, 427 (1985)
18. J. Ibanèz and E. Verdaguer, *Phys. Rev. D* **34**, 1202 (1986)
19. F. Rahaman, P.K.F. Kuhfittig, K. Chakraborty, A.A. Usmani and S. Ray, *Gen. Relativ. Gravit.* **44**, 905 (2012)
20. J.K. Beem and K.L. Duggal (Editors), *Differential Geometry and Mathematical Physics*, American Mathematical Society, Printed in United States of America, Vol. 170, 1-63 (1994).
21. P.S. Apostolopoulos and M. Tsamparlis, arXiv:gr-qc/0110042 (2001)
22. M. Sharif and N. Tehseen, *Chin. J. Phys.* **45** 592 (2007)
23. K.L. Duggal and R. Sharma, *J. Math. Phys.* **27** 2511 (1986)
24. R.J. Gleiser, C.N. Kozameh and O.M. Moreschi, *General Relativity and Gravitation* (edited), Proceedings of the 13th Int. Conf., Cordoba, Argentina (1992)
25. H. Stephani et al., *Exact Solutions of Einstein's Field Equations*, Cambridge Press (2003)
26. M. Tsamparlis, *J. Phys.: Conference Series* **68** 012016 (2007)
27. M. Ramzan, A. Kanwal and M.S. Shabbir, *Int. J. Theor. Math. Phys.* **3** 103 (2013)
28. I. Yavuz, I. Yilmaz, H. Baysal, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **14**, 1365 (2005)
29. R.L. Bowers and E.P.T. Liang, *Astrophys. J.* **188**, 657 (1917)
30. R. Ruderman, *Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **10**, 427 (1972)
31. M. Kalam, F. Rahaman, S. Ray, Sk. M. Hossein, I. Karar, and J. Naskar, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **72**, 2248 (2012)
32. E. Spallucci, A. Smailagic, and P. Nicolini, *Phys. Lett. B* **670**, 449 (2009)
33. F. Rahaman, P.K.F. Kuhfittig, B.C. Bhui, M. Rahaman, S. Ray, and U.F. Mondal, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 084014 (2013)
34. A. Pradhan, G.S. Khadekar, M.K. Mishra, and S. Kumbhare, *Chin. Phys. Lett.* **24**, 3013 (2007)
35. F. Rahaman, S. Bhowmick, G.K. Ghosh, S. Ray, I. Karar, and H.I. Fatima, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **23**, 1450042 (2014)
36. F. Rahaman, M. Kalam, and S. Chakraborty, *Gen. Relativ. Gravit.* **38**, 1687 (2006)
37. P.B. Demorest, T. Pennucci, S.M. Ransom, M.S.E. Roberts, ans W.T. Hessels, *Nature* **467**, 1081 (2010)
38. P.C.C. Freire et al., *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **412**, 2763 (2011)
39. M.L. Rawls, J.A. Orosz, J.E. McClintock, M.A.P. Torres, C.B. Bailyn, and M.M. Buxton, *Astrophys. J.* **730**, 25 (2011)
40. P.M. Takisa, S. Ray and S.D. Maharaj, *Astrophys. Space Sci.* **350**, 733 (2014)
41. F. Rahaman, A. Banerjee, I. Radinschi, S. Banerjee, and S. Ruz, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **51**, 1680 (2012)
42. Sk. M. Hossein, F. Rahaman, J. Naskar, M. Kalam, and S. Ray, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **21**, 1250088 (2012)
43. M. Kalam, F. Rahaman, Sk. M. Hossein, and S. Ray, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **73**, 2409 (2013)
44. F. Rahaman, S. Islam, P.K.F. Kuhfittig, and S. Ray, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 106010 (2012)
45. J.B. Hartle and K.S. Thorne, *Astrophys. J.* **153** 807 (1968)

46. W.G. Laarakkers and E. Poisson, *Astrophys. J.* **512** 282 (1999)
47. M. Shibata, *Phys. Rev. D* **67** 024033 (2003)
48. L. Iorio, *Class. Quantum Gravit.* **23** 5451 (2006)
49. L. Iorio, H.I.M. Lichtenegger, M.L. Ruggiero and C. Corda, *Astrophys. Space Sci.* **331** 351 (2011)
50. L. Iorio, *Phys. Rev. D* **84** 124001 (2011)
51. K. Boshkayev, H. Quevedo and R. Runi, *Phys. Rev. D* **86** 064043 (2012)
52. G. Renzetti, *Can. J. Phys.* **90** 883 (2012)
53. L. Iorio, M.L. Ruggiero and C. Corda, *Acta Astron.* **91** 141 (2013)
54. B. Barker and R. O'Connell, *Phys. Rev. D* **10** 1340 (1974)
55. N. Ashby and T. Allison, *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.* **57** 537 (1993)
56. L. Iorio, *Nuo. Cim. B* **116** 777 (2001)
57. L. Iorio, *Gen. Relativ. Gravit.* **44** 719 (2012)